DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 190 08 CG 001 362

By-Ohlsen, Merle M.

AN EVALUATION OF A COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM DESIGNED FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS ENROLLED IN 1965-66 NDEA INSTITUTE.

Illinois Univ., Urbana. Coll. of Education.
Bureau No-BR-6-8087
Pub Date Sep 67
Grant-OEG-3-7-068087-0375
Note-61p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$2.52
Descriptors-*COUNSELOR EDUCATORS, COUNSELOR ROLE, *COUNSELOR TRAINING, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), JOB SATISFACTION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION

This study determines the impact of the 1965-66 NDEA Institute for the preparation of elementary school counselors on its 30 enrollees. Using a definition of the elementary school counselor's role, the institute staff developed a program including statistics, counseling theory and practice, group procedures, mental hygience, personality and child development, learning theories, exceptional children, diagnosis and treatment of learning problems, and a year practicum. Data were collected at the beginning and end of instruction and after at least one semester on the job. The guidance clearly suggests that enrollees mastered new professional knowledge and skills, and came to believe in themselves as professionals. Group counseling touched enrollees' personal lives, seeming to increase their self-confidence, self-acceptance, understanding, and human relations skills. Enrollees felt that better use could have been made of films and video recordings. More emphasis seems needed in developing competencies in the consulting role. More instruction seems needed in curriculum and guidance, vocational development for children, and the use of referral agencies and community resources. The strongest features were practicum, group counseling, and relationships with the staff and peers. (Author/PH)

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

F I N A L R E P O R T

Project Number 6-8087 -08
Grant Number OEG 3-7-068087-0375

AN EVALUATION OF A COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM DESIGNED FOR PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS ENROLLED IN 1965-66 NDEA INSTITUTE

Merle M. Ohlsen
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois
September 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ED022190

CG 001 362

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, ILLINOIS

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Rationale for the Study	3
Objectives for this Research	4
Definition of the Counselor's Role	5
Objectives for this Institute	5
The Institute Program	6
Related Literature for this Research	11
Procedures	14
General Design	14
The Sample	14
Data and Instrumentation	16
Statistical Analysis	18
The Results	18
Perceptions of Professional Role	18
Professional Impact of Institute on Enrollees	25
Personal Impact of Institute on Enrollees	28
Job Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers	32
Weaknesses of the Institute	34
Strengths of the Institute	34
References	36
Appendices	
A End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet	39
B Nelson's Evaluation Sheet	48
C Counselor's Role Description, Course Evaluation, and Job Satisfaction	50
D Occupational Characteristics Index	59

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Job Functions Listed as Most Descriptive of Their Role. . .	19
2.	Job Functions Labelled as Least Descriptive of Their Role .	20
3.	Functions for Which Perceptions of Importance Changed: 1965-1966	21
4.	Job Functions for Which Perceptions of Importance Changed: 1966-1967	23
5.	Evaluation of Relevance and Quality of Instruction.	26
6.	Nelson's Evaluation for Areas of Professional Preparation .	27
7.	Problems Revealed in Periodic, Intensive Interviews	28
8.	Mean of Ranks of 1965-1966 Enrollees Priority Needs on Edwards	30
9.	Descriptive Words that Best Describe Enrollees.	31

Summary

This study tried to determine the impact of the 1965-1966 NDEA Institute for the preparation of elementary school counselors on its enrollees. The writer concluded that appraisal of professional education needs no defense. Everyone involved in professional education should expect to evaluate his program periodically. Unfortunately, few such studies have been done for counselor education.

A counselor education staff must define clearly the counselor's role before its members can develop an appropriate graduate program for him. The University of Illinois counselor education staff decided that an elementary school counselor should be prepared to counsel children, to counsel parents concerning their children's school adjustment problems, and to consult teachers and parents--focussing on helping them to understand and to further normal development, and wherever possible to prevent problems which interfere with normal development. Members of the staff also believe that an elementary school counselor should be encouraged to solicit teachers' and parents' assistance in helping him to better understand his clients. Based on this definition of the counselor's role, the staff developed a program which included statistics, counseling theory and practice, group procedures, mental hygiene, personality development, child development, learning theories, exceptional children, diagnosis and treatment of learning problems, and a year long series of practicum experiences involving work with children, parents, and teachers. The staff also encouraged these prospective counselors to take advantage of the opportunity afforded by group counseling to better understand and accept themselves and to recognize and to learn to cope with those unresolved problems which seemed to interfere with their effectiveness as school counselors.

Most of the data for this study were collected at three times: beginning of instruction, end of instruction, and after at least one semester on the job. Boney's instrument was used to identify changes in perceptions of job priorities. For assessing the professional and personal impact of the Institute on enrollees, data were obtained from three sources: periodic, intensive interviews, follow-up interviews, and End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet. In addition to these sources Nelson's Evaluation Sheet was used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the Institute.

Thirty enrollees (two withdrew so late that only one qualified alternate was left) were selected from 158 qualified applicants. The Institute staff concluded that good enrollees were selected. Even though the Miller scores and undergraduate grade point average failed to correlate significantly with counseling success, the director recommended that they be used in the future to predict scholarship in graduate education. He also recommended the continued use of Strong Vocational Interest Inventory, the autobiography, recommendations from employers and teacher educators and the diagnostic interview to screen applicants for counselor education.

The evidence clearly suggests that enrollees mastered new professional knowledge and skills. They also reported that they came to look upon

themselves as professionals, to realize what they could do, developed the confidence to do it, and clarified their professional goals.

The Institute also touched their personal lives. They sought help with the problems that they recognized when they came and with other problems that they discovered during graduate education. Group counseling provided assistance with problems concerned with self-understanding; self-acceptance, self-confidence, marriage and family and inter-personal relationships. Peers helped enrollees with academic problems and the development of their ideas. Apparently, the staff provided most individual assistance in mastering subject matter and improving counseling skills. Both 1965-1966 and 1966-1967 enrollees mentioned as most significant for them: increased self-confidence, increased self-acceptance and understanding, and improved human relations skills.

Like every other program this one had its weaknesses. Apparently enrollees felt that more and better use could have been made of films and video recordings. In spite of the increased emphasis this year on the consulting role, some enrollees would have liked more assistance in developing competencies in this role. The instructional areas in which they felt that they developed least competence were curriculum and guidance, vocational development for children, and use of referral agencies and community resources.

In contrast, the primary strengths of the Institute were the calibre of the enrollees, the calibre of staff, the intellectual climate, the learning resources--especially the library, and the cooperating school setting in which enrollees were placed for pre-practicum and practicum. Enrollees reported that the strongest features were practicum, group counseling, relationships with the staff and peers.

Rationale for the Study

The study was designed to evaluate the impact of the 1965-1966 Institute for the preparation of elementary school counselors at the University of Illinois on its enrollees. The evaluation study attempted to assess the impact of the Institute during graduate education and after at least one semester of employment. It also solicited from these former enrollees their suggestions for improving their graduate preparation. Wherever appropriate the 1966-1967 enrollees' evaluations were used to supplement the 1965-1966 enrollees' evaluations.

Appraisal of a professional education program needs no defense. Everyone involved in professional education should expect to evaluate his program periodically. However, Cohen (1961) reported that counselor educators have rarely evaluated the impact of their programs upon prospective counselors. Moreover, Hill and Green (1961) discovered that the few studies reported were status studies. No studies were found which attempted to evaluate systematically the impact of counselor education on prospective elementary school counselors. Obviously such studies are needed for systematic improvement of counselor education.

Had most of these enrollees been counselors prior to attending the Institute, the logical procedure would have been to appraise their professional competencies on the job in terms of specific criteria prior to the Institute and again at some specified time following the Institute. There were at least three reasons why this could not be done: (1) only two were assigned to full-time, and four were assigned to part-time, counseling duties prior to the Institute (the other twenty-three were full-time teachers); (2) many accepted positions in other school districts, and the setting is believed to influence effectiveness of a counselor; and (3) better criteria are needed to evaluate counselors' services on the job. In addition to the writer, Patterson (1967) and Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) agreed that such criteria are needed to evaluate counselors' effectiveness. However, this investigator believes that counselor educators cannot afford to wait until such adequate criteria are developed. They must use what they know now to evaluate those phases of the program which lend themselves to evaluation.

In his study concerned with predicting counselor effectiveness Dole (1964) concluded that enrollees could be relied on to help appraise their own effectiveness:

> Analysis of the self-appraisal tasks suggests that effective counselors were able to distinguish appropriately between qualities and skills, to select professionally relevant answers; to look at themselves honestly, and to present intelligent plans for professional growth (p. 118).

Dole's conclusions with reference to very similar research subjects supports the use of the kinds of self-reporting devices used for appraising the impact of this Institute on its enrollees.

For an effective counselor education program the staff must have a clear perception of the professional role for which they are preparing workers; must be able to convey this role to enrollees, and to encourage them to react, to evaluate, and to re-define this role; to select enrollees carefully on the basis of some criteria that makes sense to them, and wherever possible these should be supported by research evidence; to help each enrollee to understand and accept himself, using his strengths and learning how to prevent those weaknesses which cannot be corrected with reasonable effort from interferring with his effectiveness; to help each master relevent knowledge, concepts, principles, and skills; and to help him implement these on the job. To appraise such a program adequately requires a follow-up of enrollees on the job as well as evaluation of learning during graduate education.

Objectives for this Research

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. How did these prospective counselors perceive their professional role when they completed the Institute?

2. How did their perceptions of their role change during professional education? Did their perceptions tend to agree better with staff's perceptions at the end than at the beginning of the Institute?

3. Were their end-of-Institute perceptions of role maintained on the job?

4. What was the <u>professional</u> impact of the Institute on enrollees? Did they increase significantly their mastery of professional knowledge? For what professional skills did they increase their mastery? Were these skills maintained and applied on the job? With what professional problems were they confronted? From whom did they obtain assistance with these problems, and in what setting?

5. What was the <u>personal</u> impact of the Institute on these enrollees? With what personal problems were they confronted? From whom did they obtain assistance, and in what setting? What were the most significant features of the Institute for enrollees? In what ways did their perceptions of themselves change?

6. What were their job satisfiers and dissatisfiers?

7. What did enrollees report as the chief weaknesses of the Institute? What suggestions did they make for correcting these weaknesses?

8. What did enrollees report as the chief strengths of the Institute?

Definition of the Counselor's Role

When the investigator was asked by U. S. Office of Education personnel to prepare an institute proposal for the preparation of elementary school counselors, he invited his colleagues to help him appraise the strengths and weaknesses of their current program. He also reviewed the most recent literature concerned with definition of the elementary school counselor's role and his professional preparation. On the basis of this work, a program (which will be described later) was developed to prepare the elementary school counselor to counsel children, to counsel parents concerning their children's school adjustment problems, and to consult teachers and parents--focussing on helping them to understand and to further normal development, and wherever possible to prevent problems which interfere with normal development, and on enlisting their assistance in helping him to better understand his clients. Several recent studies concerned with determining elementary school counselors', teachers', and principals' perception of the elementary school counselor's role support the above definition of his role: McDougal and Reitan (1963), McCreary and Miller (1966), and Smith and Eckerson (1966). This definition of the elementary school counselor's role is also supported by the work of several important professional committees: Meek's (1967) paper reviewing a decade of work by an ASCA Committee, ACES Sub-Committee on the Preparation of Elementary School Counselors (1967), and ACES-ASCA Committee on the Elementary school Counselor (1966). However, the ACES-ASCA Committee did assign the elementary school counselor the additional responsibility for coordinating pupil personnel services. Inasmuch as other pupil personnel workers have tended to be itinerate workers--serving a number of schools by providing a specific service for each, but tending not to become an integral part of the staff, it is logical for this committee to assign the coordinating function to the counselor. In fact, being a regular member of a school's staff seems to be an essential condition for the success of the elementary school counselor. If, therefore, by serving several schools this feeling of belonging is weakening for staff and pupils, the quality of the counselor's service will be damaged.

Objectives for this Institute

1. To increase the enrollee's understanding of human behavior, of techniques for appraising the impact of school and home environments on children, of counseling and guidance theories and practices, and of the research literature on elementary school counseling, child growth and development, and classroom learning and to help him apply this knowledge in defining and implementing his role as an elementary school counselor.

2. To help him to better understand himself, to help him identify and use his strengths, and to help him recognize and correct and/or compensate for those weaknesses which may interfere with his success in counseling with children and parents and consulting with teachers and parents.

3. To teach enrollees the counselor's ethics and to help them apply these principles in their daily relationships with pupils, parents and colleagues.

4. To increase each enrollee's competencies in helping teachers identify those children with whom they would like assistance, describe these pupils, discuss their feelings toward these pupils, and determine cooperatively, and specificly, what they can do to improve the children's school adjustment.

5. To improve his ability to use non-test and test data to help teachers to better understand their pupils, and to help their pupils to better understand themselves, including what they have a right to expect from themselves intellectually.

6. To help him identify essential guidance services for elementary school children, to determine which he should be expected to provide, and who should be expected to provide other essential pupil personnel services, and to master essential knowledges and skills needed to provide appropriate in-service education for his colleagues who are to provide these other services.

7. To help him to recognize and to develop his professional responsibilities for leadership.

8. To help him apply his knowledge of statistics and research methods to evaluate other's research and to appraise the outcomes of guidance services which he provides.

The Institute Program

For eight years preceding the first NDEA Institute for the preparation of elementary school counselors, the University of Illinois had graduated from two to seven elementary school counselors each year. The minimum program varied from the equivalent of one academic year's work and one summer to one academic year and two summers, depending on the candidate's undergraduate background in elementary education and psychology. Based upon this experience, the staff's experiences as consultants to school programs, and the fact a teacher rarely can be released for more than one year, the staff decided to include all the required courses for the two-year program in the Institute program of a year and two summers. This left the two remaining summers for electives. When the U.S. Office of Education did not allow the first summer work for the 1965-1966 Institute, it was listed as prerequisite work for the Institute. Most enrollees came to the University of Illinois for this pre-Institute work. Thus, the instruction can be divided into four time blocks.

1. 1965 Summer Session. The 1965-1966 enrollees were taught two courses: an introductory course in statistics to provide background knowledge for use and interpretation of tests, for reading research, and for designing research to appraise their services; and a basic course in test and measurements, including appraisal of tests commonly used in elementary schools.

When these enrollees strongly recommended earlier placement in cooperating schools for pre-practicum experiences and the University was given the additional summer for the 1966-1967 Institute, the individual counseling course was substituted for the tests and measurement course. In addition to the usual didactic instruction, it included considerable role playing and staff demonstrations.

2. Fall semester - 1965. Two of the courses dealt with the study of human behavior: one stressed mental hygiene and personality theories, and the other focussed on human growth and development. For the first Institute the other three courses consisted of individual counseling, principles of guidance, and the integrating seminar. Each seminar professor, along with his assistant, supervised the pre-practicum experiences in cooperating schools.

   Inasmuch as applications for the second Institute showed that most enrollees had completed the introductory course in guidance, the course on use and interpretation of tests was substituted for it. A laboratory period was also added on the use of tests. As indicated above, the tests and measurements course was substituted for the counseling course for the second Institute. In order to provide background for the course in the use and interpretation of tests, these two measurement courses were taught in two eight week blocks; the tests and measurements course was obviously taught in the first block.

3. Spring Semester - 1966. The second semester work included courses in learning theories, group counseling and group work techniques, the practicum, and the integrative seminar. With the five practicum professors and their assistants taking over the practicum supervision, the professors for the three sections of the seminar were able to devote full time to such topics as the counselor's ethics, issues in elementary school guidance, current trends in elementary school guidance, implementing the counselor's role, unique characteristics of the consultant's role, and design of research to appraise the impact of the counselor's services. In addition to the regular practicum, supervised laboratory experiences were provided by the two professors of the group course.

   The 1965-1966 enrollees began their pre-practicum work in the cooperating schools the first week in November. At first they spent a half day a week in the schools. Gradually they increased this time in the schools until the last couple of weeks they were spending a full day in the schools. For pre-practicum there were three sections. Each professor was assisted by an advanced graduate student. In addition to the two hours for group supervision, each enrollee had a least one hour of individual supervision each week during the first semester. Occasionally he was visited in his cooperating school. As a consequence of the end-of-Institute evaluations, the formal instruction in counseling was moved up to the summer for 1966-1967 enrollees so that they could begin their work in the cooperating

schools the first week in October. They also were encouraged to observe less, to get involved in counseling and consulting earlier, and to move more quickly to a full day of work in the schools.

Enrollees responsibilities were gradually increased as they improved their competencies. During the first semester enrollees' work in cooperating schools included observation of children in an effort to assess the other pupils' and the teachers' impact upon pupils selected cooperatively by the teacher and the counselor for special study and these children's impact upon others in their classroom; use of non-test and test data in studying children; interpretation of tests used regularly in their schools; assisting in parent conferences; consulting teachers; and counseling children. The 1966-1967 enrollees tended to become engaged in the helping relationship more quickly. This had two advantages over the longer period in the observer role: they got acquainted with pupils and staff more quickly; and their role was conveyed more accurately. In part, the latter point could have been a carry over from the previous year. On the other hand, by moving more quickly into counseling and consulting they were not able to devote as much time to practicing and critiquing their observation skills.

Typically an enrollee worked with only a couple of teachers and their pupils the first semester. With more time available the second semester, and with increased competencies, they gradually made themselves available to more teachers and parents. For the practicum during second semester each enrollee worked in his cooperating school two days a week counseling individual children, counseling groups of children, counseling and consulting parents, and consulting teachers. For this work each enrollee was given four hours of group supervision and at least two hours of individual supervision: one hour by his practicum professor and one hour by the graduate assistant.

For sectioning in the integrative seminar (pre-practicum supervision for the first semester) and the practicum, enrollees reported to their elected three-man executive committee with whom they would like most and like least to work (for choice of both fellow enrollees and professors). Ten enrollees were assigned to each seminar section for the entire academic year and six were assigned to the practicum for the second semester. Besides this work the executive committee played an important role in improving communication between enrollees and the staff: conveying both enrollees' gripes and the things that they liked.

4. The 1966 summer session provided instruction in the exceptional child and the diagnosis and treatment of learning problems. The latter included a practicum. The primary purpose of these courses was to provide essential background to enable enrollees to function better as teacher consultants rather than to function as specialists in these areas. To further this purpose, the second year a specialist in behavioral therapy with children was employed to teach the exceptional child course. Besides the usual coverage on the exceptional

child, he devoted considerable time to application of behavioral modification techniques with these children, and arranged for enrollees to visit the classrooms in which his research on these techniques were being studied.

The formal instruction was supplemented by special lectures.

Speaker	Topic	Date
Merle Ohlsen, Prof. Ed. Psych. University of Illinois	The Elementary School Counselor	9-27-65
Henry Kaczkowski, Asst. Prof. Ed. Psych, U. of Illinois	Role and Function of the Elementary School Counselor	10- 8-65
Julius Seeman, Prof. of Psych. Peabody College	Techniques for Differentiating Between Well-Adjusted and Disturbed Youth	10-11-65
	Motivation for High Achievement	10-11-65
	Levels of Communication: Using Non-Verbal Cues in Counseling	10-12-65
Fred Proff, Prof. Ed. Psych. University of Illinois	Non-Verbal Behavior as a Function of the Communication Process	10-15-65
David Brison, Asst. Prof. Ed. Psych., U of Illinois	Guidelines for Observing Children's Behavior	10-18-65
William Lewis, Assoc. Prof. of Ed., U. of Mo., Kansas City	Characteristics of Good School Guidance Programs	11- 2-65
	Definition and Implementation of Counselor's Role in Schools	11- 2-65
	Professional Growth and Development on the Job	11- 3-65
Lloyd McCleary, Prof. of School Adm., U. of Illinois	Interpersonal Communication Within a School Staff	11- 5-65
Alfred Brophy, Assoc Prof. Ed. Psych., U. of Illinois	Career Development: Implications for Elementary School Children	11-15-65
J. Don Boney, Asst. Prof. Ed. Psych., U. of Illinois	The Cultural Factor in Intelligence Testing	11-22-65
John McGill, Prof. El. Ed. University of Illinois	Role of Elementary School Principal: Implications for Elementary School Counselor	12- 6-65

David Brison, Asst. Prof. Ed. Psych., U. of Illinois	Implications of Recent Research in Cognitive Development	1-7-66
Rudolph Dreikurs, Director Alfred Adler Inst., Chicago	Family Group Counseling	1-13-66
	Basic Elements of Adlerian Psychology	1-14-66
	Demonstration in Family Group Counseling	1-14-66
David Ausubel, Prof. Ed. Psych., U. of Illinois	Forum on Child Development	3-14-66
Sidney W. Bijou, Prof. Psych. University of Illinois	Use of Skinnerian Methods with Children	3-21-66
Janet Wollersheim, Clinical Psychologist, U. of Illinois	Behavioral Counseling with Children	3-28-66
Harry M. Tiebout, Assoc. Prof. of Phil., U. of Illinois	Freudian Psychology: A Philosopher's Analysis	4-18-66
	Existential Psychology: A Philosopher's Analysis	4-20-66
Dorothy Rowand, School Social Worker, Champaign	The School Social Worker	4-25-66
John Ferguson, Prof. of Ed. U. of Missouri	Current Models for Elementary School Counselor Functioning	4-28-66
	My Definition of an Elementary School Counselor's Responsibilities	4-29-66
Morton Bradman, Champaign County School Psychologist	The School Psychologist	5- 2-66
C. H. Patterson, Prof. Ed. Psych., U. of Illinois	Phenomenological Psychology	5- 9-66

Since group counseling was often listed as one of the most significant features of the Institute for enrollees, it will be described briefly. Its purpose was to help enrollees to better understand themselves and to help them to recognize and to cope with those unresolved problems which seemed to interfere with their effectiveness as elementary school counselors. At the beginning of the fall semester group counseling was described for enrollees. They were told why it is relevant for counselors, what would be expected from them in a group, how they may volunteer for it, and why they would have to convince the counselors

that they really wanted to participate, that they were willing to discuss the problems that bothered them, and that they were willing to change their behavior and attitudes. Third and fourth year graduate students in clinical psychology and counseling and guidance provided the counseling. Each was supervised by qualified staff members. Most participants soon discovered that they could deal with the personal problems that bothered them and with the professional problems that they were meeting or expected to meet on the job. For both Institutes those who presented themselves first tended to be most committed to counseling and to profit most from it. In any case, careful screening of those who volunteered for counseling seemed to be an important factor. Making the prospective client responsbile for demonstrating his readiness to deal openly with his problems, for willingness to help others as well as to obtain help for himself, for making a commitment to change relevant behavior and attitudes, and for expecting, and even putting pressure upon other clients, to change theirs is essential for effective group counseling.

Related Literature for this Research

Perhaps the most relevant question for counselor educators to ask themselves is: Are counselors doing what we prepared them to do? If not, why not? Did we define the counselor's role inappropriately or did we define it appropriately, but failed to help him implement it? Could it be that we selected the wrong kinds of persons for professional education? Or did we really give any serious attention to selection? Did we try to define defensible criteria for selection, and then really use them for screening prospective counselors?

Chenault (1964) challenged counselor educators with the claim that their expectations are making some prospective counselors behave as phonies:

> Professional cliches like "The counselor must be genuine" present an implicit contradiction. Students sense an apparent assumption that one can cause genuineness into being through will. But a genuine feeling is one which is already there, unsought. Attempting to create such qualities through intentional effort suggests that they are behaviors to be performed rather than natural manifestations of already-existing feelings. Genuine feelings are not techniques to be mastered.
>
> One doesn't get to be "warm" by eager, personal effort. Real warmth is spontaneous and natural, and the contrived straining for it only blocks its reality. To forgo this striving does not leave us with a laissez-faire fatalism surrendering the fact of growth; it leaves an awareness that genuineness comes, not from the futile seeking of "practiced naturalness" or "disciplined spontaneity", but from a feeling of the same kind of peripheral vision of the mind exemplified in the wu-wei (not-making) of Taoism. A genuine counselor is free to be himself.

> Instead of becoming warm and genuine, the student in our traditional programs acts as if he were warm and genuine. In acting out his perceptions of the genuine counselor, he forever widens the gap between his honest viewing of himself and the external ideal perpetuated on him by the profession. He learns to live in our play-like world.
>
> Students must feel free to be whatever they are if their growth is to be natural rather than pretended. . . . (450).

For similar reasons Olsen (1963) criticized counselor education. He believes that it is very difficult for those who come from the teaching profession to give up their authoritarian (and/or evaluative) approach to students in order to function effectively as counselors. He believes (and this writer agrees) that during their professional preparation they are severely criticized for their ways of relating to students, they they begin learning new ways of relating (or pretend to be as Chenault suggests), but that they fail to integrate these new attitudes and behaviors into their style of living. Without supervision on the job, they tend to revert back to their old attitudes and behaviors--especially when their fellow counselors, and their employers assign functions, which reinforce the old behaviors and attitudes. Kemp's (1962) study substantiates this pattern.

One of the obvious things to do is for counselor educators to select less authoritarian students. Furthermore, if teaching experience reinforces inappropriate attitudes and behaviors for counseling, then counselor educators must work either to drop the teaching requirement for counselor certification or recruit from only those with minimum experience. Mazer et. al. (1965) argued thusly:

> As guidance and counseling emerges as a profession with a behavioral repertoire, body of knowledge, and skills distinct from teaching, traditionally sanctioned criteria for entry into the field increasingly need justification. Many able students already burdened by an abundant array of graduate courses in guidance and counseling turn away from school counseling because they view the teaching requirement as a prohibitive and perhaps superfluous obstacle. If the teaching requirement is to remain an important, if not decisive, factor for entry into the field, then the arguments in favor of teaching background must be subjected to empirical validation. . . . (p. 81).

Four studies support Mazer's concern about the negative influence of extended teaching experience on counselors' effectiveness as counselors: Campbell (1962), Farwell (1962), Mazer (1965), and Mazer, Severson, Axman, and Ludington (1965). Those with teaching experience tended to be more action oriented--seeking immediate solutions to problems, to ignore adequate attention to interpersonal relationships, to use more evaluative responses, and to do more advising, tutoring, and information giving than those without teaching experience. The last study cited above indicated that even teaching experience of relatively short duration

tends to strongly reinforce evaluative responses. Perhaps, as Mazer suggested, more appropriate kinds of persons would be attracted directly to counseling than can be recruited from the teaching profession.

Actually, the writer believes that top-notch counselors can be recruited from teaching, and furthermore that teaching experience can increase the counselor's effectiveness as a consultant to teachers and administrators. Obviously, it also increases their opportunities for employment. On the other hand, there should be some provision for exceptionally well qualified persons without teacher certification and teaching experience to obtain essential school background through other experiences in the schools. Moreover, counselor educators must screen all applicants for graduate study with great care--avoiding authoritarian persons, especially those with many years of teaching experience. In other words, and in spite of inadequate criteria for evaluating counselors' success, there are some things that counselor educators can do to select better candidates for counselor education (See the description of the sample).

One may infer from Olsen's (1963) paper that verbal training, and even supervised practicum, is not sufficient to define a professional role and establish it in the job. However, the writer believes this can be enhanced by open, genuine relationships among students and staff and by a strong in-group feeling and commitment to a professional quality performance which are often developed in a special group of graduate students such as members of an NDEA Institute. Group counseling also can encourage the development of these essential qualities. When counselor educators ask (or infer by their unspoken expectations) prospective counselors to give up attitudes and behaviors which were satisfying to them as teachers, they must help these enrollees discover new sources of satisfaction on the job and help them recognize and learn to cope with the reinforcers of old behaviors and attitudes. At least for now, follow-up support and evaluation on the job are essential in order for counselor educators to achieve these goals.

Merton, Reader, and Kendall (1957) contend that those who are concerned with professional education must take account of the nature of and the opportunities for social interaction and the extent of staff commitment and involvement in the program as well as staff expectations, the course sequence, and professional interactions:

> We have provisionally assumed that in the course of their social interaction with others in the school, of exchanging experiences and ideas with peers, and of observing and evaluating the behavior of their instructors (rather than merely listening to their percepts), students acquire the values which will be basic to their professional way of life (p. 42).

Thus, opportunities to learn from one another as well as from the staff becomes very important in accepting, integrating, and applying professional attitudes, and perhaps in defining a professional role for themselves and their other professional colleagues.

Further support for this point of view is presented by Schlossberg (1963):

> Full-time study would seem to stimulate continuous interaction between students and ideas, among themselves, and with faculty. Part-time study, on-the-contrary, too often occurs in a vacuum where students cannot benefit from the important adjunctive ways in which professionalization is transmitted in a full-time program.
>
> Still further evidence supports the desirability of full-time training. In an evaluation of the first Teachers College, Columbia, Counseling and Guidance Training Institute under Title V-B of the National Defense Education Act, it was found that the development of desired competencies for guidance stemmed from concurrent combinations of experiences rather than from isolated experiences or course offered seriatim. Analysis of the data from this evaluation further revealed that a particular experience likewise can lead to a variety of competencies over and above those for which it was designed (p. 287).

Consequently, this investigator will ask not only what knowledge, concepts, and skills enrollees have learned but from whom and in what setting. He also enlisted enrollees' assistance in trying to identify the agents which reinforce each learning.

Goode and Cornish (1964) concluded that long and carefully planned professional preparation, reinforced by on-the-job affiliations, were needed to establish a self-image as a professional.

Procedures

General Design

This study was designed to try to assess the impact of the 1965-1966 NDEA Institute for the preparation of elementary school counselors on its 29 enrollees. Most of the data were collected at three times: beginning of instruction, end of instruction, and after at least one semester on the job.

The Sample

Screening of enrollees for this Institute began with examination of over a thousand inquiries and applications. After some special encouragement to prospects who looked good on the basis of incomplete data to complete their applications, this number was rather easily reduced on basis of their current employment and incomplete applications to 158 qualified applicants. Screening on the basis of official transcripts, Miller's scores, completed application forms, an autobiography, and letters of recommendation from employers and teacher educators reduced this number to 78. In addition to the above data, scores from the Ohio State Psychological Examination, the Minnesota Multiphasic

Personality Inventory, the Strong Vocational Interest Inventory, and The NDEA Comprehensive Examination were used for the second stage of screening. At least one other staff member, and usually two besides the director, used these test scores along with the other data in each folder to reduce the number to 43. The remaining 43 were interviewed by a member of the University of Illinois counselor education staff or well qualified substitutes--usually former doctoral students who were familiar with the intensive, diagnostic type of screening interview used at the University of Illinois (Ohlsen, 1967, Appendix C). Of the thirty selected prior to the beginning of the 1965 summer session, two resigned at the end of the 1965 summer session: one to marry and the other for a rather serious physical problem. Only one of the alternates who had completed the prerequisite courses could be released from his school contract at that late date. Hence, the Institute operated with 29 enrollees.

When they were selected all the enrollees were employed in elementary schools: two as full-time counselors, four as part-time counselors, and twenty-three as full-time classroom teachers. Prior to being accepted for the Institute nine had completed master's degrees in either elementary education or child development (or psychology). All but eight had begun graduate work; most had completed at least one course in guidance, but no one had completed more than four of the courses taught in the Institute program.

At the end of formal instruction, the Institute staff agreed that outstanding enrollees were chosen. For example, the mean raw score on the Miller was 57. Twenty-two were employed as school counselors; four returned to teaching positions, but two of them did some part-time elementary school counseling on their own; one took a camp counseling position for an elementary school district, and two began doctoral work in counselor education. To give some further idea of the calibre of the 1965-1966 enrollees, three were accepted for doctoral study at Illinois, six others were encouraged to complete doctorates at Illinois, and four plan to complete doctorates at other universities. For the 1966-1967 group five were accepted for doctoral study at Illinois, but three elected to get more counseling experience before continuing their advanced work; six others were encouraged to take doctorates at Illinois, and four others have been accepted for doctoral study at other universities. All except the two who continued graduate study and the one who returned to her teaching position because she was on sabbatical and her district did not have an elementary school counseling position open for 1967-1968 were employed early as elementary counselors.

Appraisal of selection procedures used in the selection of 1965-1966 enrollees revealed that scores on the Ohio State Psychological Examination and the NDEA Comprehensive Examination failed to correlate significantly with any of the six criterion scores (Ohlsen, 1966). Hence, these were not used for screening of 1966-1967 enrollees. This research also raised some serious doubts about using the Miller, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and undergraduate grade point average to predict success as counselors.

A similar study was reported on 1966-1967 enrollees in the director's technical report (Ohlsen, 1967). Except for two new criterion scores

pertaining to the staff's and enrollee's perceptions of enrollees as scholars, none of the correlations with Miller scores were significant, but at least no significant negative correlations were obtained as there were for the 1965-1966 enrollees. Neither did Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory scores, Undergraduate GPA, or NDEA Comprehensive Examination scores correlate significantly with any of the nine criterion scores. Apparently the two latter measures are of little or no value in predicting counseling success as evaluated by peers and staff during graduate education, but they appear to be of some value in predicting who will be able to maintain a satisfactory grade point average. Similarly, perhaps the staff use of MMPI scores kept some deviants out of these Institutes. The lack of consistency between findings for 1965-1966 and 1966-1967 groups also raised some doubts about the value of Edwards Personal Preference Schedule in predicting counseling success. Like Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) the investigator found that social service occupations scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Inventory was one of the best predictors of counseling success. Like them he also found that better counselors tended to have higher interest maturity scores than poorer counselors. Though no data were collected to evaluate it as a selection device, the University of Illinois staff believes that the intensive, diagnostic interview was one of the most effective devices used in both Institutes to screen enrollees.

Data and Instrumentation

Inasmuch as the results seemed to make most sense when the findings were divided into six categories, the devices used to collect these data will be described in terms of these six categories: (1) Perceptions of Professional Role, (2) Professional Impact of the Institute on Enrollees, (3) Personal Impact of Institute on Enrollees, (4) Job Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers, (5) Weaknesses of the Institute and (6) Strengths of the Institute.

For the 1965-1966 enrollees Boney's Q-sort (Boney and Glofka, 1967) was administered to identify changes in perceptions of priorities of 60 job responsibilities. During the 1966 summer session it was revised by Mendelson (1967) to be used by the ACES Sub-committee on Preparation of Elementary School Counselors to obtain data for their report. This revision merely called for a different rating, a re-statement of one item, and addition of six new items (See Part II, Appendix C).

For assessing the professional impact of the Institute on enrollees, data were obtained from three sources: periodic, intensive interviews, End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet (The open-ended questions which were used for 1965-1966 enrollees were revised into the instrument in Appendix A for 1966-1967 enrollees), and intensive, follow-up interviews. The same sources provided the data for personal impact of the Institute, the weaknesses of the Institute, and the strengths of the Institute.

Three intensive interviews were conducted by the graduate assistants for the 1965-1966 enrollees: early October, early March (at beginning of practicum), and early June (end of practicum). Not only were they good counselors but for this purpose they were briefed to follow

the procedures described below. Each enrollee was told that this was an opportunity for him to discuss freely the problems that bothered him, to decide what he could do about each, and do it. The interviewer was instructed to try to develop an accepting, permissive climate; to listen carefully until the enrollee was given an opportunity to reveal what really bothered him without contaminating remarks by the interviewer; and then go back over those problems which the enrollee had revealed to help him decide what he could do about each to improve his chances for profiting from the Institute. These discussions revealed each enrollee's problems and his perceptions of weaknesses in the Institute. Finally, each was asked to comment on strengths of the Institute. In subsequent interviews he was also asked what he had done about problems revealed in previous interviews.

A similar pattern was followed in the follow-up visits to former enrollees on the job. (Most of these visits were made by the Institute director). Several weeks before a visit, the former enrollee, and his principal, completed the Counselor's Role Description, Course Evaluation, and Job Satisfaction instrument (The principal completed only his version of that part concerned with duties and an evaluation of the counselor), Appendix C. Several weeks prior to each visit the director cleared a date for the visit to the former enrollee's school, arranged to interview the principal, and a group of the teachers who had worked most closely with the counselor. He also sent a briefing sheet to each so each would know ahead of time what the purpose of the visit was and what kind of information was wanted from each. The core questions were: What does your elementary school counselor do? What would you like for him to do? How has he helped you? How has he helped pupils with whom you have worked? What has been his impact in the school? What suggestions can you pass on to me to help me better prepare such people? What should he have known or have been able to do that we failed to teach him? Besides these questions the former enrollees were asked the following questions: What was the most significant feature of the Institute for you? What was its professional impact on you? What was its personal impact on you? What were its primary strengths and weaknesses, and how may we correct the latter? With what problems are you confronted now? How may I help you with them while I am here?

To assess the personal impact of the Institute on enrollees, the director also administered the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Occupational Characteristics Index (Appendix D) pre- and post.

Nelson's Evaluation Sheet (Appendix B) was also administered to supplement End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet's evaluation of areas of formal instruction.

Finally, the last section of Appendix C was used to identify sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This is based primarily on Myers' (1964) research, but also was influenced to a lesser degree by Wernimont's research (1966).

Statistical Analysis

Since the investigator did this study for elementary school counselors and school administrators as well as counselor educators, he asked himself this question in choosing statistical techniques to be used to determine whether chance alone could account for the observed differences in pre-, post- and follow-up scores: What method that is appropriate for my data will enable me best to communicate my findings to my readers? On the basis of these criteria he decided to use a simple t-test to determine whether or not observed differences in means of related measures could be accounted for by chance alone. For example, a mean rank for each of the role descriptions was computed for all of the enrollee's responses for a given Institute. To determine whether chance could account for the changes between pre- and post-testing, a t-test was made for each of the 60 items for the 1965-1966 enrollees (and for each of the 66 items for the 1966-1967 enrollees, see appendix C).

For the content analysis of the free responses, and the recorded interviews, the investigator used Antenen's (1963) method. It was recently revised and adapted for a similar use by Schwartz and Ohlsen (1967).

The Results

This section of the report is divided into the six parts described in the previous section.

Perception of Professional Role

Here the investigator tried to determine the priority to which elementary counselors assigned various job functions, the extent to which these priorities changed during professional education and employment, and the extent to which the elementary school counselor's role overlaps the school psychologist's role. For his study with Glofka, Boney reviewed the professional literature to identify the thirty job functions most often assigned to the elementary school counselor and the thirty assigned to the school psychologist. These sixty items made up Boney's original Q-sort. On the basis of the staff's experiences with the 1965-1966 enrollees, Mendelson (1967) added six new items pertaining to elementary school counseling for his study and for 1966-1967 enrollees.

Boney's Q-sort forced 1965-1966 enrollees to divide the 60 items into seven piles. These piles were numbered from 1 to 7, the latter being the most highly valued function for elementary school counselors. The mean was computed for each of these items for all 29 enrollees for each item to give the mean rankings reported in Tables 1, 2, and 3. For the final analysis of Mendelson's study he assigned 7 to the A's, 6 to the B's, 4 to the "✓", 2 to the D's, 1 to the F's, and 0 to items which were not checked by an individual. Thus, for the revised instrument (Part II, Appendix C) the rankings varied from 0 to 7. Of course mean rankings were then computed in the same manner as they were for Table 1 (except there were 30 enrollees for 1966-1967).

Table 1

Job Functions Listed as Most Descriptive of their Role

	Job Functions	Pre-Test	Post-Test
16.	Conduct group counseling sessions with students having learning and emotional problems.	6.1	6.8*
39.	Identify and counsel underachieving pupils.	6.2	6.1
47.	Make classroom observations to determine how pupils having adjustment problems are functioning with peers and how teachers are relating to them.	6.0	5.7
4.	Arrange parent conferences to discuss the family situations which might be affecting the child's school adjustment.	5.6	5.8
17.	Conduct group sessions with teachers which are focused on self-understanding and ways in which they may better cope with emotional problems of pupils in the classroom.	5.3	5.5
12.	Confer with teachers on problems of motivating students in learning.	5.1	5.6
43.	Interpret test and non-test data to teachers in order to help them better appraise their pupils.	5.1	5.1
40.	Initiate case conferences with the school psychologist, school nurse, and other pupil personnel workers regarding pupils with emotional and learning problems.	5.3	4.9
21.	Conduct play therapy sessions with emotionally disturbed pupils.	4.8	4.9
24.	Coordinate in-service education programs concerning the mental health aspects of teaching.	4.6	4.9

*Designates a shift in mean ranking which is significant at .05 level.

Table 2

Job Functions Labelled as Least Descriptive of their Role

	Job Functions	Pre-Test	Post-Test
15.	Conduct action research studies of comparative methods of instructional procedures and materials in conjunction with the curriculum development.	2.3	2.7
3.	Administer school ability tests.	2.7	2.8
9.	Be responsible for the evaluations and educational placement of pupils who are physically handicapped.	3.2	2.5
49.	Meet with parent groups to acquaint them with the educational program of the school.	2.9	2.8
1.	Administer individual intelligence tests.	3.2	2.8
57.	Prepare statistical summaries of aptitude and achievement test results.	3.0	2.9
62.	Serve as chairman of the building test selection committee.	3.4	3.0
56.	Prepare statistical reports of test results comparing groups of pupils' educational growth over a period of years.	2.8	3.1
14.	Conduct a course that will help children develop the attitude that all honest occupations are worthy of respect.	2.8	3.1
11.	Collect and interpret pertinent research for the purpose of decision-making by administrators and special committees considering innovations in curriculum and instructional procedures.	2.8	3.1

Table 3

Functions for Which Perceptions of Importance Changed: 1965-1966

	Job Function	Pre-Test	Post-Test
16.	Conduct group counseling sessions with students having learning and emotional problems.	6.1	6.8**
4.	Initiate case conferences with the school psychologist, school nurse, and other pupil personnel workers regarding pupils with emotional and learning problems.	5.3	4.9*
19.	Conduct interviews with pupils, teachers, administrators, and parents as a means of collecting information pertinent to making a valid assessment of a child's developmental history.	5.3	4.4**
13.	Confer with teachers who wish help in clarifying instructional objectives and defining them in measurable terms.	3.1	4.1**
55.	Prepare case histories of pupils experiencing difficulties in adjusting to the school environment.	4.5	4.0*
66.	Test any new pupils who transfer to the school without adequate ability and achievement data.	3.4	3.9*
58.	Prepare written reports of pupil evaluations for teachers, parents, and other referral psychological agencies.	4.2	3.6*
63.	Serve as consultant to faculty study groups, PTA meetings, departmental meetings, etc. for improving their group procedures.	2.3	3.4**
48.	Make recommendations to the department of curriculum and instruction concerning achievement weaknesses as determined from standardized measures of achievement.	2.7	3.3**
44.	Interpret to teachers the functions of other pupil personnel specialists in the school district.	3.8	3.1**
2.	Administer individual tests of personality to pupils who are identified as having emotional problems.	3.8	2.8**
15.	Conduct action research studies of comparative methods of instructional procedures and materials in conjunction with the curriculum department.	2.3	2.7*
9.	Be responsible for the evaluation and educational placement of pupils who are physically handicapped.	3.2	2.5**

**designates a shift in mean ranking which is significant at .01 level.

Most of the items that 1965-1966 enrollees ranked highly in their priority also were ranked highly by 1966-1967 enrollees. For those which 1966-1967 enrollees ranked in their top eleven, all except three new items and two of the old items also were ranked highly by 1965-1966 enrollees. All these functions focus on the helping relationship, involving assistance for pupils, teachers and parents. They support the literature on role description presented in the third section of this report. These functions certainly do not include the diagnostic functions usually assigned to the school psychologist.

The contrast between Tables 1 and 2 is striking. Whereas the functions listed in Table 1 stressed helping relationships, those listed in Table 2 are primarily diagnostic, administrative or statistical in nature. Most of the functions in Table 2 are usually assigned to the school psychologist. Like 1965-1966 enrollees, 1966-1967 enrollees perceived those functions as most descriptive of their work which involved helping persons, and least descriptive of their work those diagnostic functions which are normally assigned to the school psychologist. There were three (out of eleven) noteworthy exceptions among least descriptive items in the 1966-1967 enrollee's responses:

29. Counsel teachers concerning their own personal problems.
28. Counsel parents concerning their own personal problems.
21. Conduct play therapy sessions with emotionally disturbed pupils.

For item 29 the following statement in APA Ethical Standards for Psychologists (1953) is relevant:

> Psychologists should not enter into clinical relationships with members of their own family, with intimate friends, or persons so close that their welfare might be jeopardized by the dual relationship (p. 52).

With reference to item 28 the Institute staff stressed the importance, because of pressure on the counselor's time, of the counselor trying to limit his counseling services to parents to helping them improve their children's school adjustment rather than attempting to provide personal counseling for them.

Finally, the Institute staff stressed early identification of problems, short-term counseling with reasonably healthy children, prevention, and developmental counseling in preference to long-term treatment of a few disturbed children. Hence, 1966-1967 enrollees assigned low priority to item 21.

A careful examination of Tables 3 and 4 revealed a number of similar changes in job priorities. There also were reasonably good correlations between 1965-1966 enrollees' pre- and post- rankings (.88), pre- and follow-up rankings (.60) and post- and follow-up rankings (.56). Enrollees' rankings also tended to agree significantly with staff's rankings of these priorities: pre-ranking vs. staff (.62); post-ranking vs. staff (.72); and follow-up ranking vs. staff (.36).

Table 4

Job Functions for which Perceptions of Importance Changed: 1966-1967

	Job Functions	Pre-Test	Post-Test
23.	Consult with teachers concerning pupils with whom they want assistance.	5.20	6.27*
27.	Counsel children in groups.	4.87	6.20*
16.	Conduct group counseling sessions with students having learning and emotional problems.	4.20	5.67**
17.	Conduct group sessions with teachers which are focused on self-understanding and ways in which they may better cope with emotional problems of pupils in the classroom.	2.40	4.70**
4.	Arrange parent conferences to discuss the family situations which might be affecting the child's school adjustment.	3.27	4.47*
43.	Interpret test and non-test data to teachers in order to help them better appraise their pupils.	2.53	3.53*
40.	Initiate case conferences with the school psychologist, school nurse, and other pupil personnel workers regarding pupils with emotional and learning problems.	2.40	3.47*
42.	Interpret sociometric data to teachers.	1.33	3.47**
37.	Expedite referrals of students to outside agencies and serve as a liaison between these agencies and the school community.	1.40	3.23**
18.	Conduct in-service training with teachers in test administration procedures.	1.40	3.07**
24.	Coordinate in-service education programs concerning the mental health aspects of teaching.	2.03	3.07*
54.	Participate in staff conferences regarding the retention of pupils.	1.83	2.83*
52.	Participate in conferences with teachers, supervisors, and administrators concerned with assigning children to learning groups.	1.47	2.63*
61.	Serve as a consultant to administrators and designated committees in evaluating and revising pupil records.	1.23	2.30*

Table 4 (continued)

		Pre-Test	Post-Test
38.	Hold staff meetings to acquaint teachers with referral procedures.	0.87	2.27**
26.	Cooperate with PTAs, YMCAs, church groups, and special school classes in giving talks on such topics as family relations, boy-girl problems, and similar issues.	1.13	2.20*
64.	Serve as resource person to the administrator in planning and conducting in-service meetings on the development and use of pupil records.	1.20	2.17*
50.	Orient pupils to the junior high school by arranging tours of the receiving school and having formal orientation programs.	1.17	2.03*
41.	Interpret ability test results to individual parents.	0.53	1.90**
32.	Develop referral forms for use of teachers and administrators to community agencies.	0.93	1.80*
7.	Assist teachers in setting up remedial learning groups.	0.77	1.77*
59.	Refer children to welfare agencies.	0.63	1.63*
30.	Discuss ability test results with parents in group settings.	0.67	1.43*
51.	Outline a program of personality remediation to teachers and parents.	0.20	0.90*
65.	Serve on curriculum committees in a consultative capacity on issues in planning, revising or evaluating instructional programs of study with psychological dimensions.	0.93	2.13**
9.	Be responsible for the evaluation and educational placement of pupils who are physically handicapped.	0.83	0.13*

*designates a shift in mean ranking which was significant at .05 level;
**designates .01 level.

Professional Impact of Institute on Enrollees

The professional impact of the Institute on enrollees was appraised in terms of the mastery of professional knowledge exhibited on the NDEA Comprehensive Examination, the staff's appraisal of professional skills, and enrollee's perception of mastery of knowledge and skills (including their appraisal of the quality of teaching and the relevancy of the learning experiences). Included in the appraisal is content analysis of follow-up interviews.

The means for post-test scores on NDEA Comprehensive Examination were significantly higher (at .01 level) for both Institutes than their pre-test means. Both groups also reported in the intensive interviews and End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet that they had mastered much new pro-professional knowledge. In fact, some felt that they had been pushed too hard to master all that was expected of them.

From their supervision of enrollees' performance in pre-practicum and practicum experiences and of individual research projects, the members of the staff concluded that enrollees improved their counseling skills with children and parents, their skills as consultants to teachers and parents, their ability to read, interpret, and use others' research, and a few enrollees improved their research skills. Though enrollees improved their skills for working with parents, this is one area for which they were not provided enough experience and hence they felt least competent when they completed the Institute. When 1965-1966 enrollees began their work on the job they found that they were more competent that their colleagues, and this seemed to engender increased confidence in working with parents. On the other hand, though they established good working relationships with teachers, follow-up visits revealed a need for more didactic instruction and supervised practice in consulting teachers.

During formal instruction 1965-1966 enrollees often griped about the repetetive treatment of two topics: definition of professional role and the development of specific plans to implement that role. In the follow-up interviews they reported that though it was probably over-done, it paid off on the job. Other items that stood out in follow-up interviews with reference to professional impact of the Institute were: increased professional skills, clarification of professional goals, and increased self-confidence in themselves as professionals. For the investigator it was a thrilling experience to visit these committed professionals and to observe how they had genuinely tried, and with considerable success, to apply what they had learned in the Institute.

How relevant were the learning experiences provided by the Institute? How good was the instruction? Except for the fact that 1965-1966 enrollees felt that too much emphasis was placed upon mastering research studies and on developing research skills, their reactions to these will be reported in the discussion of strengths and weaknesses. For the 1966-1967 enrollees, however, these reactions can be readily summarized in two tables, 5 and 6. Table 5 summarizes their reactions to End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet (Appendix A) and Table 6 summarizes reactions to Nelson's Evaluation Sheet (Appendix B).

Table 5

Evaluation of Relevance and Quality of Instruction

	Abbreviated statement of item	Mean rating
1.	Clearly stated objectives of Institute	4.47
2.	Emphasis of program coincided with expectations	5.37
3.	Realistic objectives	5.83
4.	Extent of enrollees' interest in subject matter	5.87
5.	Feeling of group solidarity	4.97
6.	Over-all morale of enrollees	5.57
7.	Individual's own morale	5.80
8.	Attitude of enrollees toward other graduate students	5.33
9.	Attitude of other graduate students toward them	5.10
10.	Work load of program	5.20
11.	Adequacy of library facilities	5.90
12.	Adequacy of physical facilities	4.77
13.	Communication between enrollees and staff	5.43
14.	Adequate use of new teaching materials	4.27
15.	a. Accuracy of evaluation of enrollee's work	5.23
	b. Fairness of evaluation of enrollee's work	5.40
16.	Level of competition for grades, prestige, etc.	5.87
17.	Evaluation of various components in the program	
	a.1 Counseling techniques - relevance	5.73
	a.2 Counseling techniques - quality of teaching	4.93
	b.1 Pre-practicum and seminar - relevance	5.43
	b.2 Pre-practicum and seminar - quality of teaching	4.67
	c.1 Practicum - relevance	6.40
	c.2 Practicum - quality of teaching	5.33
	d.1 Psychological foundations - relevance	5.40
	d.2 Psychological foundations - quality of teaching	4.67
	e.1 Seminar - relevance	5.13
	e.2 Seminar - quality of teaching	4.50
	f.1 Tests, measurements, and statistics - relevance	5.80
	f.2 Tests, measurements, and statistics - quality of teaching	5.07
	g.1 Diagnosis and treatment of learning problems - relevance	4.97
	g.2 Diagnosis and treatment of learning problems - quality of teaching	5.25
	h.1 Exceptional child and behavior modification - relevance	5.39
	h.2 Exceptional child and behavior modification - quality of teaching	4.50
	i.1 Social foundations - relevance	3.23
	i.2 Social foundations - quality of teaching	4.07
18.	Over-all reaction to the Institute	
	a. Relevance	6.63
	b. Quality of teaching	5.43

Table 6

Nelson's Evaluation for Areas of Professional Preparation

	Statement of the item	Mean rating
1.	Definition of guidance	6.03
2.	Understanding of development of guidance movement	4.07
3.	The helping relationship	6.00
4.	Ethical considerations	5.40
5.	The child and mental health	5.47
6.	The child and his self concept	5.87
7.	Family pressures and guidance	4.77
8.	Societal pressures and guidance	4.77
9.	Educational pressures and guidance	5.50
10.	Understanding behavior dynamics	5.43
11.	Role of elementary school counselor	6.67
12.	Theories of counseling	5.93
13.	Applying counseling theory in elementary schools	5.63
14.	Techniques in counseling elementary school children	6.13
15.	Facilitating verbalization in counseling children	5.07
16.	Implications of play in counseling children	4.43
17.	Counseling with play media	3.90
18.	Group guidance procedures	5.40
19.	Group counseling with children	6.07
20.	Supervised counseling with children	6.33
21.	Consulting with parents, teachers, etc.	5.20
22.	The elementary school child	5.40
23.	Child development	5.43
24.	Individual appraisal--with tests	4.87
25.	Tests and measurements	5.80
26.	Identification of children with special problems	4.23
27.	Curriculum and guidance	3.50
28.	Learning theory	5.00
29.	Vocational and educational understanding	3.13
30.	Application of vocational development theory	2.77
31.	Community resources	3.00
32.	Referral resources	3.47
33.	Facilities necessary for program	4.83
34.	Trends in elementary school guidance	5.37
35.	Research in elementary school guidance	5.40
36.	The exceptional child	4.60
37.	Application of behavior modification in schools	5.13
38.	Diagnosis and treatment of learning problems	4.30
39.	Statistics	5.17
40.	Techniques for evaluation of elementary guidance	4.67
41.	Group guidance techniques for parents	4.73
42.	Group counseling techniques for parents	4.93
43.	Improved understanding of yourself	6.00
44.	Your own personal growth and development	6.20

When enrollees asked whom they should use as a reference group in completing the responses in Table 5 (Appendix A), they were told to compare Institute instructors to all other college instructors whom they had had. They were also told to use "4" as the average rating on this seven point scale. With reference to this last point they were given the same answer for Table 6.

Personal Impact of the Inscitute on Enrollees

Sources of data for assessing the personal impact of the Institute on enrollees came from five sources: content analysis of intensive periodic interviews, End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet, pre- and post-testing on Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and Occupational Characteristics Index (Appendix D), and content analysis of follow-up interviews.

With what problems were enrollees confronted during their Institute study? Content analysis of the three intensive interviews with 1965-1966 enrollees by graduate assistants is reported in Table 7. Problems mentioned in the miscellaneous category in Table 7 included such topics as conflict with parents or other relatives, concern about behavior which is incongruent with their moral code, and concern about health problems.

The fact that the total number of problems mentioned by 1965-1966 enrollees decreased significantly as they moved through the Institute suggests that they did face up to their problems and solved them. This also was true for 1966-1967 enrollees.

From the beginning to the end of the Institute, 1966-1967 enrollees also reduced significantly the total number of problems revealed in periodic interviews. In particular, they reduced significantly their

Table 7

Problems Revealed in Periodic, Intensive Interviews

The problems revealed	I	II	III
Self: Concern about background or academic ability	17	12	3**
Self: Time to complete required work	12	5	3*
Self: Occupational goals	9	8	14
Self-concern about self as counselor	17	17	12
Self: marital relation or sexual adjustment	9	7	7
Self: relations with own children	5	5	2
Peer relations	10	7	8
Relations with authority figures (instructors or employers)	23	15	7*
Financial--questions on adequacy of resources	8	5	3
Non-affect topics: places, things, etc.	17	6	10*
All other problems mentioned	20	25	16

*Chance can account for these observed differences only 5% of the time.

**Chance can account for these observed differences only 1% of the time.

concern about themselves as persons and their concern about coping with authority figures. These changes were very similar to the ones noted in Table 7 for 1965-1966 enrollees.

The one problem area for which 1965-1966 enrollees' concern increased is clarification of professional goals. Unlike the early commitments which 1966-1967 enrollees got for full-time employment as elementary school counselors, 1965-1966 enrollees had to wait for these commitments. Apparently elementary school counseling was seen as such a new service in many areas of the country that funds were not committed until very late last year. Some 1965-1966 enrollees stated that perhaps it would take several years for the need for their service to be recognized. However, eventually everyone obtained commitments for the kinds of positions that they wanted except for two who wanted to live in a specific town and two who were on sabbatical and had to return to home districts which had not begun elementary school counseling. Perhaps the reader will recall that in spite of this problem, 1965-1966 enrollees revealed in the follow-up interviews that one of the most important professional outcomes of the Institute for them was clarification of professional goals.

The End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet requested 1965-1966 enrollees to report from whom they received assistance with various types of problems, Similar information also was requested toward the end of the second and third periodic interviews. Since enrollees were encouraged to seek counseling from those who would not be called upon to evaluate them, few enrollees were counseled by the staff. Enrollees participated in group counseling in four groups (three of which were for only enrollees or enrollees and their spouses). The counselor for only one of these four groups was a graduate assistant for the Institute. The other three were all third or fourth year level doctoral candidates: two from clinical psychology and one from educational psychology. From their counseling groups 1965-1966 enrollees cited 38 specific problems with which they received assistance. Though these covered a wide range of topics, most could be classified into one of three categories: self-understanding and acceptance, interpersonal relations, and family problems. Other counseling experiences, usually provided by graduate assistants for the Institute, provided assistance with twenty similar personal problems.

Enrollees reported 16 instances in which they obtained help from professors of didactic courses with techniques, course requirements, and study methods. They cited 32 instances in which they obtained help from pre-practicum and practicum professors with problems concerning techniques, counseling style, definition of professional role, methods of implementing their role in the schools, and their behavior with clients. Fifty-eight specific instances were recalled in which they obtained assistance from peers: examining issues, testing ideas, and tutorial help.

Content analysis of follow-up questionnaires (Appendix C) and on-the-job interviews revealed that the four most significant features of the Institute for 1965-1966 enrollees were practicum, group counseling,

interaction with enrollees and staff, and a specific course. A variety of courses was listed here, but the group counseling course was listed more often than all the others combined. When asked what was the personal impact of the Institute on them, they answered: improved interpersonal relations skills, increased self-confidence, and increased self-understanding and acceptance. Enrollees for the 1966-1967 Institute listed the same items on their End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet.

From the above observations one would expect that 1965-1966 enrollees would have changed their priority of needs markedly. The pre- and post-testing on Edwards Personal Preference Schedule did not reveal such marked changes. The scores reported in Table 8 are about what one would expect from counselors. The need for dominance is perhaps higher than counselor educators would prefer but not higher than one would expect for a group recruited from teachers. Moreover, the changes in need priority tend to support the changes that they associated with group counseling. For example, one would expect that increased self-confidence and acceptance of self would be exhibited along with increased autonomy.

Table 8

Means of Ranks of 1965-1966 Enrollees' Priority of Needs on Edwards

Needs	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Heterosexuality	5.21	3.39*
Intraception	3.89	5.43
Change	6.32	5.61
Autonomy	8.28	5.82*
Exhibition	6.57	5.86
Affiliation	7.36	6.14
Dominance	5.46	6.54
Achievement	6.68	7.21
Succorance	9.04	8.78
Aggression	9.46	8.82
Deference	8.32	9.89
Abasement	9.86	11.89*
Endurance	10.64	11.89
Order	12.11	12.82

*Changes in mean ranks this large can be accounted for by chance no more than 5% of the time.

Except for autonomy which had a mean rank of eighth, their needs were ranked similarly by 1966-1967 enrollees. Similar significant shifts were noted: heterosexuality and autonomy were raised and abasement was lowered but not quite significantly (only at .10 level).

For the Occupational Characteristics Index (Table 9) enrollees were required to examine combinations of descriptive words five at a time and to rank them in terms of their own strengths (or for their ideal self in terms of what each wished his strengths were).

Table 9

Descriptive Words That Best Describe Enrollees

Descriptive words	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Dependability	7.4	7.5
Fairness	7.5	8.0
Cooperativeness	8.0	8.3
Enthusiasm	9.6	8.5
Patience	10.8	8.6
Emotional stability	9.4	8.9
Self-control	8.5	9.3
Considerateness	8.6	10.0
Resourcefulness	8.9	10.1
Flexibility	9.7	10.6
Judgment	9.7	10.7
Verbal fluency	11.2	11.2
Imagination	11.4	11.7
Ambition	12.1	11.8
Knowledge of subject matter	13.5	12.2
Vigor	12.7	13.1
Creativeness	13.6	13.2
Originality	12.5	14.0
Forcefulness	17.3*	14.3
Persuasiveness	14.6	14.4
Personal charm	14.0	14.6

Apparently these enrollees perceived dependability, fairness, cooperativeness, enthusiasm, patience, and emotional stability as most descriptive of their strengths. The 1966-1967 enrollees moved considerateness into these first six words, but 1965-1966 enrollees placed it number 7. For 1965-1966 enrollees only one of the descriptive words (forcefulness) changed significantly its mean rank, and only one did for the 1966-1967 enrollees (knowledge of subject matter was raised in priority). Both moved enrollees closer to the staff's perception. For the least descriptive three words enrollees and staff agreed. However, two words which enrollees listed next as least descriptive of their strengths, the staff listed as most descriptive of theirs. These two, along with verbal fluency, tended to be associated with the perception of the scholar; apparently, these enrollees saw themselves less as scholars and more as practitioners.

Another fact should be noted: ideal and actual responses correlated .72 at the beginning of the Institute and .74 at the end of it. In other words, these persons exhibited a lot on congruences--a characteristic of well-adjusted persons. A personal communication from J. M. Slater based upon his comparison of these persons with other school personnel, indicated that these are the self-other oriented persons (in contrast with self-oriented) which one would hope to attract to counselor education.

Job Satisfiers and Dissatisfiers

Mendelson (1967) did a study of outstanding elementary school counselors for the ACES Sub-Committee on the Preparation of Elementary School Counselors. With the assistance of counselor educators, guidance chiefs in the state departments, and local school administrators, the committee tried to identify the outstanding elementary school guidance programs and then the best counselors in these programs. Eventually about twenty were selected from each of ACES' five regions; 87 completed the questionnaire (See Part IV of Appendix C). The committee felt that they should enlist the assistance of the very best practitioners in evaluating job responsibilities and in developing standards for professional education. Mendelson decided that this approach also provided good subjects for the study of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. As Mendelson's adviser, the investigator encouraged him to obtain these norm data for this study. Hence, 1965-1966 enrollees' responses can be compared with a group of good practitioners.

The reason for studying job satisfaction is obvious. A profession must provide reasonable job satisfaction and either eliminate sources of job dissatisfaction or teach practitioners to cope with them.

In this instance the counselor was asked to think about a time when he felt exceptionally good about his elementary school counseling job, to describe the events which made him feel good, and to list the other elements which contributed to job satisfaction. Similar data were obtained for job dissatisfaction. The same type of content analysis described earlier were used to identify <u>specific</u> job satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Responses from Mendelson's 87 subjects were compared with the responses from 20 (out of 22) counselors, 2 teachers who were doing some counseling, and the two doctoral candidates who also supervised 1966-1967 enrollees in the schools during practicum. Chi square was used to determine whether chance could account for the observed differences.

Satisfiers were easily grouped into the eight categories listed below. Illustrative comments by counselors are copied parenthetically. * indicates that a significantly (at .05 level) higher proportion of the 1965-1966 enrollees listed this item as a satisfier than did Mendelson's sample of counselors (item #2).

1. Teachers, principal, and parents seem to understand and accept my professional role (My principal said he liked what I am doing. A teacher invited me to visit her room and observe a child).

2. Teachers and parents exhibited or reported improved understanding and/or relationships with a child (A pupil reacted to mother more kindly. A mother reacted to child with greater understanding. A teacher learned to discipline children differently).*

3. Someone recognized specific ways in which a child had been helped by the counselor (A teacher reported that a child participated in class discussion).

4. Some colleague or parent exhibited respect for the counselor's professional judgment (A teacher asked the counselor to help him interpret tests he found in his pupils' folders. A child asked to see the counselor soon after the counselor visited the child's class).

5. I recognized that I was beginning to identify with counselors.

6. The setting provided special satisfaction (A good office in which to work, reasonable school policies, colleagues encouraged me to define my role, minimal clerical work, etc).

7. There are other important variables not directly related to my particular school position (I have another counselor for whom I have respect to whom I can talk. Parents are interested in their children).

8. There were internal variables which affected job satisfaction (A personal feeling of adequacy; I recognized ways that I had helped others).

What were the dissatisfiers? Did these result from not achieving the above satisfactions? Dissatisfiers were negative statements of the same eight categories: e.g. 1. I think of an instance in which my principal, or a teacher or a parent did not understand and accept my role as I perceived it. Hence, it does not appear to be necessary to repeat the negative statement for each of those eight listed above. For these the writer will merely record typical comments under each of the categories.

1. My principal objected to my working with individual children who sought counseling on their own. A couple objected to me working with their child because they thought that I worked with only emotionally disturbed children.

2. After a short trial period a teacher gave up on a child--concluding that we cannot help him. I had a child for whom I had no idea how to help.

3. I tried very hard to help a child and he got worse.

4. A teacher criticized what the counselor was trying to do in a joint conference with parents.

5. There is no other counselor with whom I can associate or identify.

6. Such things as unnecessary clerical duties and physical facilities get me down here.*

*Significantly fewer of these comments from 1965-1966 enrollees than from Mendelson's sample of counselors.

7. Parents and teachers are not sufficiently interested in those with whom I work.

8. I am disappointed with myself and my professional preparation.

Weaknesses of the Institute

Data on weaknesses of the Institute came from four sources: periodic, intensive interviews; follow-up interviews; End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet, Part III of Appendix C: Course Evaluation; and Nelson's Evaluation Sheet. At the conclusion of the 1965-1966 Institute two weaknesses were listed: (1) need for better orientation to pre-practicum experience and (2) more use of video recordings. For (1) enrollees suggested teaching the basic counseling course earlier in the program; more supervision by staff in cooperating schools, especially during the first few weeks of placement; more emphasis on early work with children and teachers; and earlier placement in cooperating schools. All of these were done in the 1966-1967 Institute, and more use also was made of video recorders in practicum.

The responses to question 14 (Table 5, p. 26) concerning use of newer teaching materials (4.27), along with their comments, suggests that 1966-1967 enrollees also felt that more and better use could have been made of films and video recordings. In follow-up interviews, 1965-1966 enrollees also indicated they would have liked to have seen more staff demonstrations with parents and teachers.

An analysis of the enrollees' responses to Nelson's Evaluation Sheet (see Table 6, p. 27) suggests that the weakest areas of instruction were (17) counseling with play media, (27) the curriculum and guidance, (29) vocational and educational understanding for elementary school children, (30) application of vocational development theory for children, (31) community resources, and (32) referral resources. Though the director agrees that the staff should take note of these deficiencies, he does not believe that much more could be included in a year and two summers' work, and perhaps these six were less significant than what was stressed.

Three subject matter areas in which enrollees would have liked further work listed most often on the course evaluation sheet were individual testing, counseling techniques, and such psychology courses as personality theory and abnormal psychology. In follow-up interviews 1965-1966 enrollees also commented on the need for more thorough didactic instruction on consultation role and supervised experience in the practicum in implementing it.

Strengths of the Institute

For top-flight graduate education all of the following must be strengths: calibre of students, calibre of faculty, intellectual climate, and facilities--especially the library. For good counselor education the

staff must select the right people, provide them relevant didactic instruction, and provide carefully supervised, relevant laboratory experiences within cooperating schools in which enrollees are respected and permitted to try their ideas. The director believes that these were all strengths. Responses summarized in Table 4 (p. 23) support the director's opinion on relevancy very well and reasonably well on quality of instruction. The responses in this table suggest that the best teaching was done in the practicum, testing courses, and for diagnosis and treatment of learning problems. From Table 6 (p. 27) one would conclude that enrollees felt that their professional preparation was most adequate in these areas: definition of guidance, the helping relationship, the role of the elementary school counselor, theories of counseling, techniques in counseling elementary school children, group counseling with children, supervised counseling with children, and tests and measurements.

Responses to the follow-up questionnaire and interviews suggest that for enrollees the major strengths of the 1965-1966 Institute were:

1. Its personal impact upon them--improved interpersonal relations and increased self-confidence.

2. Its professional impact upon them--improved professional skills, increased professional knowledge and confidence in themselves as counselors, and clarification of professional goals.

3. Participation in group counseling.

4. The practicum.

5. Interaction with enrollees and staff.

Finally, the investigator would like to give his own personal reactions to the follow-up visit on the job for these recent graduates. He believes it encouraged enrollees to define their professional role and when they arrived on the job to begin at once to implement that role. The actual visit conveyed to teaching colleagues and the principals, as well as the former enrollee, that the University cares about its alumni and that its staff wants to help them succeed on the job. Besides providing support and enccuragement, each was given a chance to obtain assistance with the problems with which he was faced or had faced.

References

Antenen, W. W. Change in Topic and Affect During Group Counseling: Its Relationship to Outcomes of Group Counseling, An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1963.

Boney, J. D. and Glofka, P. "Counselor Educators' and Counselors' Perceptions of Elementary School Counselors' Perceptions of Elementary School Counselors' Functions", Counselor Education and Supervision, in press.

Campbell, R. E. "Counselor Personality and Background and His Interview Subrole Behavior", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9:329-334.

Chenault, Joann "The Education of the School Counselor", Phi Delta Kappa, 1964, 45:450-452.

Cohen, Nancy K. A Case Study of the Columbia Teachers College Counseling and Guidance Training Institute: 1959-1960, an unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

Dole, A. A. "The Prediction of Effectiveness in School Counseling", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11:112-121.

Ethical Standards for Psychologists, Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1953.

Farwell, G. F. "Counselors Themselves - An Issue", The School Counselor, 1962, 10:31-35.

Good, W. J. and Cornish, Mary J. Professions in American Society: Casebook and Sociological Analysis, New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Hill, G. E. and Green, D. A. "The Selection, Preparation, and Professionalization of Guidance and Personnel Workers", Review of Educational Research, 1960, 30:115-130.

Kemp, C. G. "The Influence of Dogmatism on the Training of Counselors", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9:155-157.

Mazer, G. E. "The Factorial Dimensions of School Counselor Practices", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965, 12:127-132.

Mazer, G. E., Severson, J. L., Axman, A. L., and Ludington, Karen A. "The Effects of Teaching Background on School Counselor Practices", Journal of the Personnel Association for Teacher Education, 1965, 5:81-84.

McCreary, W. H. and Miller, G. "Elementary School Counselors in California", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44:494-498.

McDougal, W. F. and Reitan, H. M. "The Elementary School Counselor: As Perceived by Elementary School Principals", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42:348-354.

Meek, Anna "Dimensions of Elementary School Guidance", Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1967, 1:163-187.

Mendelson, R. L. The Elementary School Counselor: Description of Professional Preparation, Actual Work Experiences, and Personal Qualifications, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967.

Merton, R. K., Reader, G. G., and Kendall, Patricia L. (Eds.). The Student-Physician. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Myers, M. S. "Who are your Motivated Workers?" Harvard Business Review, 1964, 42:73-88.

Nelson, R. C. "Designs for an Elementary School Counselor Preparation Program", Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6:199.

Ohlsen, M. M. Final Technical Report on the Institute for Elementary School Counselors, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1966.

Ohlsen, M. M. Final Technical Report on the Institute for Elementary School Counselors, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1967.

Olsen, L. C. "Success for New Counselors", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10:350-355.

Patterson, C. H. "The Selection of Counselors", a paper presented at Washington University, Conference on Research Problems in Counseling, January 10-13, 1967.

"Preliminary Report of ACES Sub-Committee on the Preparation of Elementary School Counselors", February 20, 1967.

"Preliminary Statement of Joint ACES-ASCA Committee on the Elementary School Counselor", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44:658-661.

Schlossberg, Nancy Cohen, "A Sociological Framework for Evaluating Guidance Education", Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42: 285-289.

Schwartz, R. K. and Ohlsen, M. M. "A Validation Study of a Content Analysis Technique for Evaluating Outcomes in Counseling", Personnel and Guidance Journal, in press.

Smith, H. M. and Eckerson, Louise O. Guidance Services in Elementary Schools: A National Survey, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, U.S. Office, 1966.

Stefflre, B., King, P. and Leafgren, F. "Characteristics of Counselors Judged Effective by Peers", Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9:335-340.

Wernimont, P. F. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors in Job Satisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50:41-52.

Appendix A

End-of-Institute Reaction Sheet
Evaluation of 1966-1967 NDEA Institute
University of Illinois

This is a questionnaire which seeks your thoughtful and frank consideration of some important questions about the Institute Program in which you have participated, with the hope of making future programs more effective.

We ask you, therefore, to be thorough and frank in completing all questions. All responses will be kept confidential. Hence, we do not want you to write your name on the questionnaire. No one except the assistant who tabulates the results will see any individual's responses. However, Mrs. Goff will check off your names as you turn in the questionnaire to insure that we obtain completed responses from everyone. Where there is a scale encircle the number that best describes your reactions.

1. How clear was your understanding of the objectives of the program before you entered it?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not clear at all						Very clear

2. How closely did the content and emphasis of the program coincide with your expectations?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very closely

3. In terms of your own interests, experiences, and job responsibilities, how realistic and useful were the objectives of the program you attended?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all realistic						Very realistic

4. Did the participants seem to be genuinely interested in the subject matter of the program?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Definitely not						Very interested

5. Was there a feeling of group solidarity among enrollees in the program?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Frequent conflict						Very close relationships

6. How would you rate the over-all morale of the participants?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very low						Very high

7. How would you rate your own morale?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very low						Very high

8. How would you characterize the attitude of NDEA Institute enrollees toward the regular graduate students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unfriendly						Very cordial

9. How would you characterize the attitude of the typical graduate student toward the NDEA Institute enrollees?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unfriendly						Very cordial

10. What is your opinion of the schedule and work load of the Program?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Much too light						Much too heavy

11. How adequate were the University library facilities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

12. How adequate were the physical facilities?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

13. How would you describe the quality of communication between enrollees and the staff?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

14. Was adequate use made of "new" teaching materials such as films, tape recordings, and video recordings?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unsatisfactory					Very satisfactory	

15. How would you describe the evaluation of your work as a student during the past year?

a.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very inaccurately					Very accurately	

b.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very unfairly						Very fairly

16. Did you find a high level of competition for grades, prestige, recognition among students?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little competition					Extremely competitive	

17. How would you rate the various components of the Institute? Please evaluate each of the following in terms of (1) the relevance for the elementary school counselor and (2) the quality of teaching (and/or supervision) provided. Where there is a wide variation in the relevance or in the quality of teaching within an instructional area please use the space provided in part (3) to identify the best instruction and most relevant course.

a. Counseling techniques (Ed. Psy. 422, 427)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

_____

_____

b. Pre-practicum (Ed. Psy. 490-Semester 1)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

_____

_____

c. Supervised practice in counseling (Ed. Psy. 424)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

_____

_____

d. Psychological foundations (Ed. Psy. 311, 312 and 412)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____ -

e. Seminar (Ed. Psy. 490)-Semester II
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

f. Tests, Measurements and Statistics (Ed. Psy. 390, 392, and 423)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

g. Diagnosis and Treatment of Learning Problems (Ed. Psy. 426)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

h. Exceptional child and behavior modification (Sp. Ed. 417)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

i. Social Foundations (Sp. Ed. 304 and 305)
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Very good

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Very good

(3)_____

18. What is your over-all reaction to this Institute?
(1) Relevance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not relevant						Highly relevant

(2) Quality of teaching

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very poor						Highly relevant

(3)_____

19. What was the impact of the Institute on you <u>personally</u>?

20. What was the impact of the Institute on you <u>professionally</u>?

21. What were the <u>most</u> significant features of the Institute for you?

22. What were the major strengths of the program?

23. What were the major weaknesses in this program for the preparation of elementary school counselors? Please note <u>specific</u> knowledges or professional skills which we should have taught you.

24. Besides trying to discover the problems that concerned you in the course of learning to become elementary school counselors, we would like to learn from whom you got help with these problems. With what kind of problems did you get help from:

a. Fellow enrollees in a non-counseling relationship?

b. Group counseling?

c. Other counseling experiences?

d. Professors in didactic courses?

e. Professors in pre-practicum and practicum supervision?

25. What were the unique features of the Institute?

Appendix B

NELSON'S EVALUATION SHEET

DESIGN FOR AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELOR PREPARATION PROGRAM by Richard C. Nelson (Purdue) (Presented in Counselor Education and Supervision, Volume 6, #3, Spring 1967, p. 199)

"Requisite counseling and related skills and ASCA recommendations suggest the inclusion of many kinds of learning in the elementary school counselor preparation program. The following are inclusions which need to be made either as brief segments of courses or as entire courses." In the left-hand margin write the number which indicates the extent to which each of these learnings were mastered: 1 not mastered at all to
7 mastered very well

1. Definition of guidance
2. The development of the guidance movement
3. The helping relationship
4. Ethical considerations in guidance and counseling
5. The child and mental health
6. The child and his self concept
7. Family pressures and guidance
8. Societal pressures and guidance
9. Educational pressures and guidance
10. Understanding behavior dynamics and purposes
11. Role of the elementary school counselor
12. Theories of counseling
13. Implications of counseling theories for counseling elementary school students.
14. Techniques in counseling elementary school children
15. Facilitating verbalization with young children in counseling
16. Implications of play in counseling young children
17. Counseling with play media
18. Group guidance procedures
19. Group counseling with children
20. Supervised counseling with elementary school children
21. Consulting with parents, teachers, and others
22. The elementary school-aged child
23. Child development
24. Individual appraisal--use of tests
25. Tests and measurements
26. Identification of children with special problems
27. The curriculum and guidance
28. Learning theory
29. Vocational and educational understandings for elementary school children
30. Application of vocational development theory for children
31. Community resources
32. Referral resources
33. Facilities necessary for the elementary school guidance program
34. Trends in elementary school guidance
35. Research in elementary school guidance
*36. The exceptional child
*37. Behavior modification and its implication for the elementary school counselor
*38. Diagnosis and treatment of learning problems
*39. Statistics

*40. Techniques for evaluation of elementary school counselor's services
*41. Group Guidance Techniques for working with parents
*42. Group counseling techniques for working with parents
*43. Improved understanding of yourself
*44. Your own personal growth and development

---

*New items added by M. M. Ohlsen

Appendix C

Counselor's Role Description, Course Evaluation, and Job Satisfaction

COUNSELOR'S FORM

TO:

FROM: Merle M. Ohlsen

I need your assistance in evaluating our 1966-1967 NDEA Institute. Since we are most apt to obtain your response if you react soon, we would like you to complete and return these forms no later than January 1, 1968.

The primary purpose of this study is to discover your actual job responsibilities, your reactions to your professional preparation and previous school expreiences, and the specific incidences in your present counseling position from which you achieve either job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction.

All individual responses will be treated confidentially; only the research assistant who analyzes the data will actually see any given responses and he will discuss these with no one. With this assurance of confidentiality, it is our hope that you will add any personal comments or observations you wish concerning the questionnaire, your training, or your position. You will note that Part I is omitted. It is not relevant for this study.

Please write your principal's name at the top of his questionnaire and then hand it to him. It would be of great help if you would use your counseling skill to get him to respond promptly. Thanks.

Appendix C (continued)

COUNSELOR ROLE DESCRIPTION (Part II)

Read every statement listed below describing elementary school counselor's work tasks. Place a check mark in front of all those you do.

Now go over all the items you checked and select:

(1) The three in which you spend the greatest amount of your time. Mark these with an "A" in front of the check.

(2) The three in which you spend the least amount of your time. Mark these with an "F" in front of the check.

(3) The next six in which you spend the most amount of your time. Mark these with a "B" in front of the check.

(4) The next six in which you spend the least amount of your time. Mark these with a "D" in front of the check.

___ 1. Administer individual intelligence tests.

___ 2. Administer individual tests of personality to pupils who are identified as having emotional problems.

___ 3. Administer school ability tests.

___ 4. Arrange parent conferences to discuss the family situations which might be affecting the child's school adjustment.

___ 5. Assist school personnel in selecting, revising and improving the group testing program.

___ 6. Assist teachers in decision-making with such problems as grouping and retention.

___ 7. Assist teachers in setting up remedial learning groups.

___ 8. Assist the school administration in devising operational criteria for identifying exceptional children, such as the gifted and mentally retarded.

___ 9. Be responsible for the evaluation and educational placement of pupils who are physically handicapped.

___ 10. Be responsible for initiating case studies of pupils with emotional, developmental and learning problems.

___ 11. Collect and interpret pertinent research for the purpose of decision-making by administrators and special committees considering innovations in curriculum and instructional procedures.

___ 12. Confer with teachers on problems of motivating students in learning.

___ 13. Confer with teachers who wish help in clarifying instructional objectives and defining them in measurable terms.

___ 14. Conduct a course that will help children develop the attitude that all honest occupations are worthy of respect.

___ 15. Conduct action research studies of comparative methods of instructional procedures and materials in conjunction with the curriculum department.

___ 16. Conduct group counseling sessions with students having learning and emotional problems.

___ 17. Conduct group sessions with teachers which are focused on self-understanding and ways in which they may better cope with emotional problems of pupils in the classroom.

___ 18. Conduct in-service training with teachers in test administration procedures.

___ 19. Conduct interviews with pupils, teachers, administrators, and parents as a means of collecting information pertinent to making a valid assessment of a child's developmental history.

___ 20. Conduct parent conferences to discuss the academic progress of their children.

___ 21. Conduct play therapy sessions with emotionally disturbed pupils.

___ 22. Consult with teachers concerning problems of improving the learning climate.

___ 23. Consult with teachers concerning pupils with whom they want assistance.

___ 24. Coordinate in-service education programs concerning the mental health aspects of teaching.

___ 25. Coordinate the school testing program.

___ 26. Cooperate with PTAs, YMCAs, church groups, and special school classes in giving talks on such topics as family relations, boy-girl problems, and similar issues.

___ 27. Counsel children in groups.

___ 28. Counsel parents concerning their own personal problems.

___ 29. Counsel teachers concerning their own personal problems.

___ 30. Discuss ability test results with parents in group settings.

___ 31. Develop local test norms for ability, achievement, and aptitude tests.

___ 32. Develop referral forms for use of teachers and administrators to community agencies.

___ 33. Do individual counseling with children who seek help on their own.

___ 34. Do individual counseling with children who are referred by their parents or teachers.

___ 35. Establish good working relationships with other pupil personnel workers.

___ 36. Evaluate and classify pupils for special instruction in areas of mental retardation, reading difficulty, and gifted classes.

___ 37. Expedite referrals of students to outside agencies and serve as a liaison between these agencies and the school community.

___ 38. Hold staff meetings to acquaint teachers with referral procedures.

___ 39. Identify and counsel underachieving pupils.

___ 40. Initiate case conferences with the school psychologist, school nurse, and other pupil personnel workers regarding pupils with emotional and learning problems.

___ 41. Interpret ability test results to individual parents.

___ 42. Interpret sociometric data to teachers.

___ 43. Interpret test and non-test data to teachers in order to help them better appraise their pupils.

___ 44. Interpret to teachers the functions of other pupil personnel specialists in the school district.

___ 45. Maintain accurate records of test protocols, reports of conferences with other school personnel and parents, and personal observations of pupils.

___ 46. Maintain an adequate supply of guidance literature and materials for teachers and parents.

___ 47. Make classroom observations to determine how pupils having adjustmental problems are functioning with their peers and how teachers are relating to them.

___ 48. Make recommendations to the department of curriculum and instruction concerning achievement weakness as determined from standardized measures of achievement.

___ 49. Meet with parent groups to acquaint them with the educational program of the school.

___ 50. Orient pupils to the junior high school by arranging tours of the receiving school and having formal orientation programs.

___ 51. Outline a program of personality remediation to teachers and parents.

___ 52. Participate in conferences with teachers, supervisors, and administrators concerned with assigning children to learning groups.

___ 53. Participate in referral conferences with teachers and administrators.

___ 54. Participate in staff conferences regarding the retention of pupils.

___ 55. Prepare case histories of pupils experiencing difficulties in adjusting to the school environment.

___ 56. Prepare statistical reports of test results comparing groups of pupils' educational growth over a period of years.

___ 57. Prepare statistical summaries of aptitude and achievement test results.

___ 58. Prepare written reports of pupil evaluations for teachers, parents and other referral psychological agencies.

___ 59. Refer children to welfare agencies.

___ 60. Retest pupils whose scores on standardized achievement and ability measures are highly variable from test to test.

___ 61. Serve as a consultant to administrators and designated committees in evaluating and revising pupil records.

___ 62. Serve as chairman of the building test selection committee.

___ 63. Serve as consultant to faculty study groups, PTA meetings, departmental meetings, etc. for improving their group procedures.

___ 64. Serve as resource person to the administrator in planning and conducting in-service meetings on the development and use of pupil records.

___ 65. Serve on curriculum committees in a consultative capacity on issues in planning, revising or evaluating instructional programs of study with psychological dimensions.

___ 66. Test any new pupils who transfer to the school without adequate ability and achievement data.

Appendix C (continued)

REACTION TO YOUR COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM (Part III)

Name_____ Age_____ Male____ Female____

School_____ City_____ State_____

Name of your School Principal_____

1. List below the names of the two courses from your counselor education program that you feel contributed most significantly to your success as an elementary school counselor.

   a._____

   b._____

2. List below the names of the two courses from your counselor education program that you feel contributed least to your success as an elementary school counselor.

   a._____

   b._____

3. List below the courses which you wish you had been able to take or would still like to take, to increase your effectiveness as an elementary school counselor.

   a._____

   b._____

   c._____

   d._____

   e._____

4. What was the impact of your counselor education program on you personally? List the particular ways in which you were most affected.

   a._____

   b._____

   c._____

   d._____

   e._____

(Part III continued - page 2)

5. What was the impact of your counselor education program on you professionally? List the specific ways in which you were most affected.

a._____

b._____

c._____

d._____

e._____

6. What were the major strengths of your counselor education program?

a._____

b._____

c._____

d._____

e._____

7. What were the major weaknesses of your counselor education program? For each weakness, wherever possible, indicate where it could be corrected.

a._____

b._____

c._____

d._____

e._____

Appendix C (continued)

JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION (Part IV)

If we are to attract top people to elementary school counseling and keep them in their work, we must learn what provides job satisfaction, what contributes to dissatisfaction on the job, and what can be done to promote satisfaction.

A. JOB SATISFACTION

Think about a time when you felt exceptionally good about your job as an elementary school counselor.

1. Describe the sequence of events which made you feel good.

2. Explain what you think it was about the incident that made you feel good. Try to recall all of the situational factors which contributed to this incident of job satisfaction, noting the <u>specific elements that really made you feel good</u>.

3. List other elements which you believe have contributed to your job satisfaction on other occasions.

B. JOB DISSATISFACTION

Think about a time when you felt exceptionally bad about your job--you were really dissatisfied with your job.

1. Describe the sequence of events which made you feel bad.

2. Now explain what you think it was about the incident that made you feel exceptionally bad. Try to recall all the situational factors which contributed to this incident of job dissatisfaction, noting the specific elements that really made you feel bad.

3. List other elements which you believe have contributed to your job dissatisfaction on other occasions.